



**Protective Orders in South Carolina:
An Examination of Variables for 1997 - 1999**

June 2001

Prepared by:

**Kimberly A. McCabe, Ph.D.
College of Criminal Justice
University of South Carolina**

Acknowledgements

This report would not have been possible without the active assistance and cooperation of the State Law Enforcement Division. Particular thanks are due to Captain Nita Dannenburg who generously made her knowledge and expertise and valuable time readily available. John R. Alphin, Lindsey E. Bostian and Bobbidawn LeGrande are also to be commended for their work towards completing this project.

This report was funded by the United States Department of Justice Bureau of Justice Statistics through the South Carolina Department of Public Safety Office of Justice Programs, grant 2000-RG-CX-K002.

Foreword

Rob McManus
Office of Justice Programs - South Carolina Department of Public Safety

The intent of this project was to explore the potential of the Protection Order File as a source of data for analysis. South Carolina, rather than creating and maintaining a separate state file, has chosen to enter protection orders directly into the National Criminal Information Center (NCIC). Although the State Law Enforcement Division, as the control terminal agency, is responsible for the NCIC interface, it does not maintain the file itself. The Protection Order File has been in use since 1997, but has not been used for statistical analysis. The genesis of this effort was the thought that these orders might provide some degree of insight into criminal and domestic violence, and that the distribution of such orders might provide an additional geographic indicator of violence in South Carolina. To the degree possible, this has been done, and the findings are outlined in Dr. McCabe's report. Unfortunately, problems were discovered that seriously limit not only the analytical use of these data, but also their tactical use.

The major limitation of these data is the degree to which they are missing. Important data regarding both the person being protected by the order and the person who was the object of the order, are missing. These missing data include race, sex, and other descriptive data necessary to identify either the protected person or the object of the order. More importantly, twenty-one (21) of forty-six (46) counties had no protection orders in the file. It seems unlikely that the lack of protective orders from these counties represents a lack of such orders at the local level, but rather more that while such orders

are being issued, they are not being entered into NCIC. Without belaboring the obvious, missing orders not only cannot be used as a data source, such orders are not utilizing the NCIC system and consequently not providing the full level of protection afforded by that system to those in need.

It was not the intent of this research to evaluate the process by which protection orders are entered into the NCIC system nor was such a study conducted. However, it is clear that serious problems exist concerning the completeness of the records submitted and the completeness of the file itself. Hopefully, this report will be of some assistance in addressing and rectifying these shortcomings.

Protective Orders in South Carolina: An Examination of Variables for 1997-1999

Introduction

In the state of South Carolina, as with the remaining 49 states, a great majority of the calls for which a law enforcement officer responds are domestic. In fact, it has been estimated that nationally, 60-70% of all police calls are domestic in nature (Makepeace, 1987). In an attempt to reduce the repeat victimization of domestic partners, in particular women, many states have begun to aggressively initiate the filing of Protective Orders. With these orders, which generally expire in six months, individuals – in most cases women – who feel threatened, intimidated, or have a history of violence between them and another individual (most likely a domestic partner), may list the name and demographic characteristics of the individual with whom they fear or have a history of fear with the local law enforcement agency in an attempt to provide law enforcement officers the information required for proactive protection.

Although some researchers have indicated that some partners feel that society approves of physical assaults (Newman, 1979) or that police foster the images of women as manipulative (Rigakos, 1995), Protective Orders are intended to provide, as their name implies, some protection to those filing Protective Orders with a law enforcement agency. To file a Protective Order within the state of South Carolina, an individual simply provides the information required to the law enforcement agency within his/her residential jurisdiction. The orders are effective immediately.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine the Protective Orders filed in the state of South Carolina. Specifically, Protective Orders were examined for the years of 1997, 1998, and 1999, in an attempt to better understand the capabilities and limitations of Protective Orders in the state. It is the goal of this research to provide some feedback to law enforcement officials the information that may assist the law enforcement agencies of the state in the formulation of policies to further support and advance the Protective Order procedures in the state.

Background

During the 1990's, nearly one-half of the Protective Orders filed in the United States were domestic-related (Marshall and Castle, 1998). However, in most cases of domestic violence, it was only the victims of the most violent, criminal men who initiated orders (Buzawa, Hotaling, and Klein, 1998). Regardless of that fact, evaluations on the use of a Protective Order (hereafter PO) are mixed. Again this research was intended to provide some feedback on POs for the state of South Carolina.

In support of POs, Carlson, Harris and Holder (1999) suggested a significant decline in the probability of abuse after the issuance of a PO. In fact, after filing a PO, only 23% of the individuals reported physical violence in comparison to 68% reporting physical violence prior to filing a PO (Carlson, et al.). Eisenberg (1979), on the other hand suggest over 20 years ago, that POs failed to help battered women as they failed to reduce the incidents of violence targeted toward them. In conclusion, during the 1980's, interviews with the recipients of POs suggested that the orders were generally ineffective (Grau, Fagam, and Wexler, 1985). Further support for the ineffectiveness of PO's was found by Rigakos (1995) who discovered in the 1990's that POs were rarely treated

seriously by the police. In addition, Stalnaker and Bell (1990) suggested that POs have little effect in deterring family violence. Finally, Websdale and Johnson (1997) suggested that POs were less effective in rural areas where law enforcement officials were more likely not to serve them at all.

Regardless of past evaluations of POs, filing a Protective Order can be the first step in attempting to reduce victimization (Cook, 1993). Whether domestic or non-domestic, for an individual to live in fear of violence seems at the very least unfortunate. If a PO can reduce the likelihood of victimization then law enforcement owes to their community an attempt to make the purpose and process of Protective Orders a success.

Methodology

The methodology used in this study to examine the Protective Orders for the state of South Carolina was one of the secondary data analysis. Protective Order files were requested through the South Carolina Department of Public Safety and USC's College of Criminal Justice from SLED for the years of 1997, 1998, and 1999. SLED officials received the completed records from the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) out of West Virginia. Once the College received the orders from SLED, identifying information - specifically the name of the individuals listed on the POs (hereafter called the "ordered person") and the names of the individuals filing the POs (hereafter called the "protected person") - were omitted from further examinations.

The entire sample consisted of 876 POs. Within each PO the following variables were examined: (1) sex of the ordered person; (2) race of the ordered person; (3) age of the ordered person; (4) height of the ordered person; (5) weight of the ordered person; (6) state of birth for the ordered person; (7) expiration year and month of the PO; (8) Brady

Bill; (9) sex of the protected person; (10) race of the protect person; and, (11) age of the protected person. In addition, to provide some feedback on POs filed per agency, ORI numbers were examined. For clarity in defining the Brady Bill variable, ordered persons with either a history of violence or with a history of firearm ownership were identified.

As criminologists often analyze data that have been recorded or gathered by government agencies or other sources (Barkan, 2001), it was felt by these researchers that the secondary analysis of POs was the most appropriate method for exploring Protective Orders in the state of South Carolina. Of course, it has been acknowledged that some limitations would exist in this form of analysis and that analysis of any of these data were only as reliable as the data (Barkan).

Explorations of these data consisted of relative frequency tables and figures. In addition, the significance test of Chi Square and the F Statistic were used to determine if differences existed between the male and female Ordered Persons, and black and white Ordered Persons. For ease of interpretation of results, Odds Ratios were used for significant differences. The intent of this research was to answer the simple question of “What information may be derived from POs in the state of South Carolina?”

Results

As displayed in Table 1 (Appendix A), as of February 9, 2001, there were 876 Protective Orders recorded for the state of South Carolina. Of those protective orders, 728 (83.1%) were against males and 579 (66.1%) were against whites. The majority of the person of which the orders were issued against were between the ages of 20 and 39 (69.2%), between the height of 5’7” and 5’11” (46.2%), and weighted between 150 and 199 pounds (53.3%). As expected, the majority of ordered persons were from the state of

South Carolina (75.6%) and had orders against them that expired in the next six months (94.8%). Figure 1-3 (Appendix B) displays the demographics of South Carolina ordered persons. In regards to a history of violence or ownership of a firearm, denoted by the Brady Bill variable, about one-third of the Protective Ordered documented a history of violence between the ordered person and the person filing the protective order.

When considering the demographics of the protected person, the majority were female (83.1%), the majority were white (66.9%) and the majority were between 20 and 39 (66.9%). Figures 4-6 (Appendix B) display the demographics of South Carolina Ordered Persons.

As displayed in Table 2 (Appendix A), when considering the sex of ordered persons (male versus female), the distribution of other demographics and behavioral characteristics varied by characteristic. Specifically, ordered persons were, for both male and female, generally white, between the ages of 20 and 39, born in South Carolina and have protective orders that expire this year. As expected, males were taller and heavier than females and in the case of both male and female ordered persons, the majority did not have a history of violence as denoted by the Brady Bill variable.

In regard to the sex of the protected persons, males were most likely to have placed Protective Orders against females, and females were more to have placed Protective Orders against males. Regarding race and age of protected persons, the distributions were similar for male and female ordered persons.

As displayed in Table 3 (Appendix A), when considering the race of ordered persons (white versus black), the distributions of the variables of interest again varied by demographic characteristic. Specifically, black and white ordered persons were more

likely to be male, between the age of 20 and 39, born in the state of South Carolina and have protective orders that expire this year. In regards to the physical characteristics of height and weight, they were similar for both black and white ordered persons. In the case of the Brady Bill variable, white ordered persons were less likely than black order persons to have a history of violence or firearm possession.

In regard to sex of the protected persons, the majority of both black and white ordered persons had Protective Orders filed by females between the ages of 20 and 39. In addition, in regard to the race of the protected persons, whites were protected against whites, and blacks were protected against blacks.

As displayed in Table 4 (Appendix A), when comparing male versus female ordered persons and other demographic characteristics, statistically significant differences existed in the variables of race of ordered persons ($p=.001$), state of birth of ordered persons ($p=.009$), Brady Bill ($p=.001$), Protectee Sex ($p=.001$), and Protectee Race ($p=.089$). In addition, as displayed in Table 5 (Appendix A), there were found to be significant differences in the age of Ordered Persons ($p=.0075$) and in the age of Protected Person ($p=.0034$). Specifically, although both the majority of the male and female ordered persons were white, female ordered persons were twice as likely to be white (Odds Ratio=2.001). Also, although the majority of both male and female ordered persons were born in the state of South Carolina, males were 1.4 times more likely to be born in South Carolina (Odds Ratio=1.372). In addition, although the majority of male and female ordered persons were not identified through the Brady Bill, males were twice as likely to be identified (Odds Ratio=2.288). Also, male ordered persons were overwhelmingly more likely (300 times) to have POs registered by females (Odds

Ratio=317.926). Finally, although most ordered persons were white, female ordered persons were nearly 1.5 times more likely to have had their orders registered by white protected persons (Odds Ratio=1.453).

As displayed in Table 6 (Appendix A), when comparing black versus white ordered persons and other demographic characteristics, statistically significant differences existed in the variables of sex of ordered persons ($p=.001$), state of birth of ordered person ($p=.001$), Brady Bill ($p=.001$), Protectee sex ($p=.006$) and Protectee race ($p=.001$). No differences, as displayed in Table 7 (Appendix A), were found in the age of ordered person and in the age of Protected persons.

Specifically, although the majority of both the black and white ordered persons were male, black ordered persons were twice as likely to be male than whiter ordered persons (Odds Ratio=2.001). In regard to South Carolina natives, white ordered persons were nearly three times more likely to be South Carolina natives (Odds Ratio=2.712). In regard to the Brady Bill variable, black ordered persons were 1.6 times more likely to have been identified (Odds Ratio=1.630). Finally, black ordered persons were nearly twice as likely to have had their orders filed by females (Odds Ratio=1.889) and white ordered persons were over 200 times more likely to have had their orders filed by whites (Odds Ratio=206.169). Figure 4 and 5 (Appendix B) display the sex and race of South Carolina's protected persons.

Limitations to Data

Although there were 876 POs filed within the state of South Carolina during 1997-1999 time periods, data were missing in 111 (12.7%) of the records. In addition,

data were not supplied for 21 of South Carolina's 46 county law enforcement agencies (45.6%) during the three-year time period.

Conclusion

In the state of South Carolina, as well as other states, domestic calls are among the most common calls for law enforcement officers. The system of Protective Orders is one attempt to reduce the repeat victimization of domestics. In South Carolina there were nearly 900 POs files from 1997-1999. Of those orders, the majority (87%) were complete. Included in the POs are not only demographic characteristics of "protectees" and "ordered persons" but also indicators of violence (Brady Bill). This report was intended to serve as an exploratory search of the capabilities and limitations of POs for the state of South Carolina and to answer the question "What information may be derived from POs in the state of South Carolina?"

References

- Barken, S.E. (2001). Criminology: A Sociological Understanding (2nd Ed). NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Buzawa, E., Hotaling, G. & Klein, A. (1998). The response to domestic violence in a model court: Some initial findings and implications. Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 16(2), 185-206.
- Carlson, M.J., Harris, S.D. & Holden, G.W. (1999). Protective orders and domestic violence: Risk factors for re-abuse. Journal of Family Violence, 14(2), 205-226.
- Cook, S.M. (1983). Domestic abuse legislation in Illinois and other states: A survey and suggestions for reform. University of Illinois Law Review, 1, 261-211.
- Eisenberg, A.D. (1979). Changes in the law affecting battered women: Past, present and future. American Journal of Trial Advocacy, 3 (1), 45-62.
- Gran, J., Fagan, J. & Wexler, S. (1985). Restraining orders for battered women: Issues of access and efficiency. Women and Politics, 4(3), 13-28.
- Marshall, J & Castle, C. (1998). Restraining Orders and Stalking Offenses in 1995 and 1996. Adelaide, SA: South Australia Office of Criminal Statistics.
- Makepeace, J. (1987). Social factors and victim-offender differences in courtship violence. Family Relations, 33(1), 87-91.
- Newman, G. (1979). Understanding Violence. NJ: Lippincott.
- Rigakos, G.S. (1995). Constructing the symbolic complaint: Police subculture and the non-enforcement of protective orders for battered women. Violence and Victims, 10(3), 227-247.
- Stalnaker, S.D. & Bell, D.J. (1990). Police referrals of family violence: A Texas family code process assessment. Police Studies, 13(2), 67-73.
- Websdale, N. & Johnson, B. (1997). The policing of domestic violence in rural and urban areas: The voices of battered women in Kentucky. Policing and Society, 6(4), 297-317.

Appendix A

Table 1.

Demographic Characteristics of Protective Orders in South Carolina's 46 Counties
(n=876).

Variable	Number	Percent
Sex of Ordered Person:		
Female	148	16.9
Male	728	83.1
Race of Ordered Person:		
White	579	66.1
Black	284	32.4
Asian	2	0.2
Unknown	11	1.3
Age of Ordered Person:		
Under 11	3	0.3
11-19	22	2.6
20-29	261	29.7
30-39	346	39.5
40-49	184	21.1
50-59	52	5.9
60-69	7	0.7
70-79	0	0.0
80	1	0.1
Height of Ordered Person:		
Under 3'	2	0.2
4'0"-4'6"	0	0.0
4'7"-4'11"	3	0.4
5'0"-5'6"	197	24.5
5'7"-5'11"	370	46.2
6'0"-6'6"	228	28.4
6'7"-6'11"	2	0.2
7'0"-7'6"	1	0.1
Missing	73	
Weight of Ordered Person:		
Under 100	3	0.4
100-149	192	24.0
150-199	428	53.3
200-249	144	17.9
250-299	33	4.1
300-349	3	0.3
Missing	73	

Table 1 (Con't).

Variable	Number	Percent
State of Birth of Ordered Person:		
AL	3	0.5
CA	4	0.7
CT	1	0.2
DC	1	0.2
FL	5	0.9
GA	15	2.7
IL	2	0.4
IN	1	0.2
KY	4	0.7
LA	1	0.2
MA	1	0.2
MD	6	1.1
MI	8	1.4
MN	1	0.2
NB	1	0.2
NC	18	3.2
NJ	7	0.7
NY	17	3.0
OH	4	0.7
OK	2	0.4
PA	10	1.8
SC	422	75.6
TN	3	0.5
TX	1	0.2
VA	8	1.4
VT	1	0.2
WA	1	0.2
WI	1	0.2
WV	2	0.4
Other (outside USA)	7	1.0
Missing	318	
Expiration Year:		
2001	830	94.8
2002	13	1.5
2003	1	0.1
No Expiration	32	3.6

Table 1 (Con't).

Variable	Number	Percent
Expiration Month:		
01	69	7.9
02	85	9.7
03	99	11.3
04	101	11.5
05	77	8.8
06	69	7.9
07	58	6.6
08	62	7.1
09	58	6.6
10	82	9.4
11	23	2.5
12	61	7.1
No Expiration	32	3.6
Brady Bill:		
Yes	291	33.3
No	585	66.7
Sex of Protected Person:		
Female	616	83.1
Male	125	16.9
Race of Protected Person:		
White	485	66.9
Black	211	29.1
Asian	3	0.4
Other	26	3.5
Missing	151	
Age of Protected Person		
Under 10	1	0.2
10-19	35	4.7
20-29	237	31.7
30-39	263	35.2
40-49	163	21.8
50-59	37	4.9
60-69	6	0.8
70-79	5	0.7
Missing	129	

Table 2.

Demographic Characteristics of Protective Orders (Male vs Female Offenders) in South Carolina's 46 Counties.

Variable	Male (n=728)		Female (n=148)	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Race of Ordered Person:				
White	465	63.9	114	77.0
Black	253	34.8	31	20.9
Asian	2	0.3	0	0.0
Unknown	8	1.0	3	2.0
Age of Ordered Person:				
4-11	2	0.3	1	0.7
12-19	16	2.2	6	4.0
20-29	212	29.1	49	33.1
30-39	285	39.1	63	42.6
40-49	162	22.2	22	14.9
50-59	45	6.2	7	4.7
60-69	7	1.0	0	0.0
70 +	1	0.1	0	0.0
Height of Ordered Person:				
Under 3'	2	0.3	0	0.0
4'0"-4'6"	0	0.0	0	0.0
4'7"-4'11"	0	0.0	3	2.2
5'0"-5'6"	99	14.9	98	70.5
5'7"-5'11"	335	50.5	35	25.1
6'0"-6'6"	225	34.0	3	2.2
6'7"-6'11"	2	0.3	0	0.0
7'0+	1	0.2	0	0.0
Missing	64		9	
Weight of Ordered Person:				
Under 100	1	0.2	2	1.4
100-149	114	17.1	75	53.9
150-199	380	62.7	48	34.5
200-249	136	15.0	11	8.0
250-299	30	4.5	3	2.2
300-349	3	0.5	0	0.0
Missing	64		9	

Table 2 (Con't).

Variable	Male (n=728)		Female (n=148)	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
State of Birth of Ordered Person:				
AL	2	0.4	1	1.2
CA	3	0.6	1	1.2
CT	1	0.2	0	0.0
DC	1	0.2	0	0.0
FL	5	1.0	0	0.0
GA	12	2.5	3	3.7
IL	1	0.2	1	1.2
IN	1	0.2	0	0.0
KY	3	0.6	0	0.0
LA	1	0.2	0	0.0
MA	1	1.2	0	0.0
MD	6	1.3	0	0.0
MI	6	1.3	2	2.5
MN	1	0.2	0	0.0
NB	1	0.2	0	0.0
NC	15	3.1	3	3.7
NJ	6	1.3	1	1.2
NY	13	2.7	4	4.9
OH	4	0.8	0	0.0
OK	1	0.2	1	1.2
PA	9	1.9	1	1.2
SC	365	76.5	57	70.4
TN	2	0.4	1	1.2
TX	1	0.2	0	0.0
VA	6	1.3	2	1.2
VT	1	0.2	0	0.0
WA	1	0.2	0	0.0
WI	1	0.2	0	0.0
WV	1	0.2	1	1.2
Other (outside US)	7	1.5		
Missing	251		67	
Expiration Year:				
2001	691	94.8	139	93.9
2002	10	1.4	3	2.0
2003	1	0.1	0	0.0
No Expiration	26	3.6	6	4.0

Table 2 (Con't).

Variable	Male (n=728)		Female (n=148)	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Expiration Month:				
01	56	7.7	13	8.9
02	65	9.0	20	13.8
03	82	11.4	17	11.7
04	78	11.8	23	15.9
05	70	9.7	7	4.6
06	59	8.1	10	6.7
07	49	6.7	9	6.0
08	57	7.8	5	3.2
09	52	7.1	6	3.9
10	68	9.4	14	9.6
11	19	2.4	4	2.5
12	47	6.4	14	9.6
No Expiration	26	3.6	6	4.0
Brady Bill:				
Yes	262	36.0	29	19.6
No	466	64.0	118	80.4
Sex of Protected Person:				
Female	592	98.5	24	17.1
Male	9	1.5	116	82.9
Missing	8		8	
Race of Protected Person:				
White	385	65.6	100	72.5
Black	179	30.5	32	23.2
Asian	2	0.3	1	0.7
Unknown	21	3.6	5	3.6
Missing	141		10	
Age of Protected Person:				
Under 10	1	0.2	0	0.0
10-19	30	4.9	5	3.5
20-29	198	32.8	39	27.5
30-39	212	35.0	51	35.9
40-49	133	22.0	30	21.1
50-59	25	5.1	12	8.5
60-69	4	0.7	2	1.4
70-80	2	0.3	3	2.1
Missing	123		6	

Table 3.

Demographic Characteristics of Protective Orders (White vs Black) in South Carolina's 46 Counties.

Variable	White (n=579)		Black (n=284)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Sex of Ordered Person:				
Male	465	80.3	253	89.1
Female	114	19.7	31	10.9
Age of Ordered Person:				
4-11	3	0.5	0	0.0
12-19	15	2.6	6	2.1
20-29	168	29.0	89	31.4
30-39	229	39.6	113	39.7
40-49	123	21.2	59	20.8
50-59	38	6.6	12	4.2
60-69	3	0.6	4	1.4
70-79	0	0.0	0	0.0
80	0	0.0	1	0.4
Height of Ordered Person:				
Under 3'	2	0.4	0	0.0
4'0"-4'6"	0	0.0	0	0.0
4'7"-4'11"	3	0.6	0	0.0
5'0"-5'6"	132	24.3	59	23.4
5'7"-5'11"	249	46.0	119	47.2
6'0"-6'6"	155	28.6	72	28.5
6'7"-6'11"	0	0.0	2	0.8
7'0"-7'11"	1	0.3	0	0.0
Missing	37		32	
Weight of Ordered Person:				
Under 100	3	0.5	0	0.0
100-149	167	30.8	53	21.1
150-199	252	46.4	139	55.4
200-249	102	18.8	42	16.7
250-299	16	2.9	17	6.8
300-349	3	0.5	0	0.0
Missing	36		33	

Table 3 (Con't).

Variable	White (n=579)		Black (n=284)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
State of Birth of Ordered Person:				
AL	2	0.6	1	0.5
CA	4	1.1	0	0.0
CT	1	0.3	0	0.0
DC	0	0.0	1	0.5
FL	5	1.4	0	0.0
GA	13	3.7	2	1.0
IL	1	0.3	1	0.5
IN	1	0.3	0	0.0
KY	4	1.1	0	0.0
LA	0	0.0	1	0.5
MA	1	0.3	0	0.0
MD	5	1.4	1	0.5
MI	8	2.3	0	0.0
MN	1	0.3	0	0.0
NB	1	0.3	0	0.0
NC	15	4.2	2	1.0
NJ	4	1.1	3	1.5
NY	9	2.5	7	3.5
OH	4	1.1	0	0.0
OK	2	0.6	0	0.0
PA	5	1.4	5	2.5
SC	249	70.1	172	86.4
TN	3	0.8	0	0.0
TX	1	0.3	0	0.0
VA	6	1.7	2	1.0
VT	1	0.3	0	0.0
WA	1	0.3	0	0.0
WI	1	0.3	0	0.0
WV	2	0.6	0	0.0
Other (outside US)	7	2.0		
Missing	224		85	
Expiration Year:				
2001	541	93.5	277	97.6
2002	9	1.6	4	1.4
2003	0	0.0	1	0.4
No Expiration	29	5.0	2	0.7

Table 3 (Con't).

Variable	White (n=579)		Black (n=284)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Expiration Month:				
01	49	8.5	20	7.1
02	57	9.8	28	9.8
03	68	11.7	28	9.8
04	65	11.2	34	12.0
05	48	8.3	27	9.5
06	50	8.6	18	6.4
07	40	7.0	17	6.0
08	45	7.7	15	5.3
09	31	5.4	27	9.5
10	54	9.3	27	9.5
11	13	2.2	10	3.5
12	30	5.3	31	10.9
No Expiration	29	5.0	2	0.7
Brady Bill:				
Yes	172	29.7	116	40.8
No	406	70.3	168	59.2
Missing	1		0	
Sex of Protected Person:				
Female	403	80.6	204	88.7
Male	97	19.4	26	11.3
Missing	79		54	
Race of Protected Person:				
White	454	93.0	25	11.1
Black	17	3.5	193	85.4
Asian	2	0.4	1	0.4
Unknown	15	3.1	7	3.1
Missing	91		58	
Age of Protected Person				
Under 10	1	0.2	0	0.0
10-19	26	5.2	6	2.7
20-29	155	30.7	89	31.3
30-39	167	33.1	113	39.7
40-49	121	24.0	59	20.8
50-59	27	5.3	12	4.2
60-69	5	1.0	4	1.4
70-80	2	0.4	1	0.4

Missing

75

0

Table 4.

Chi Square Test of Independence Results for Male versus Female Ordered Persons and Other Demographic and Behavioral Characteristics.

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Chi Square</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>P Value</u>
Race (B vs W)	10.558	1	0.001
State of Birth (SC vs Other)	6.733	1	0.009
Brady Bill (Y vs N)	14.647	1	0.001
Expiration (2001 vs Beyond)	0.213	1	0.644
Protectee Sex (M vs F)	535.201	1	0.001
Protectee Race (B vs W)	2.884	1	0.089

Table 5.

F Test Results for Male versus Female Ordered Persons and the Ages of Ordered Persons and Protected Persons.

<u>Variable</u>	<u>F Statistics</u>	<u>P Value</u>
Ordered Person's Age	2.6817	0.0075
Protected Person's Age	2.9662	0.0034

Table 6.

Chi Square Test of Independence Results for Black versus White Ordered Persons and Other Persons and Other Demographic and Behavioral Characteristics.

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Chi Square</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>P Value</u>
Sex (M vs F)	10.558	1	0.001
State of Birth (SC vs Other)	23.297	1	0.001
Brady Bill (Y vs N)	10.412	1	0.001
Expiration (2001 vs Beyond)	0.017	1	0.895
Protectee Sex (M vs F)	7.428	1	0.006
Protectee Race (B vs W)	506.367	1	0.001

Table 7.
F Test Results for Black versus White Ordered Persons and the Ages of Ordered Persons and Protected Persons.

<u>Variable</u>	<u>F Statistic</u>	<u>P Value</u>
Ordered Person Age	0.1549	0.8770
Protected Person Age	1.2652	0.2062

Appendix B

Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3




Figure 4




Figure 5

